## REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 16-21 have been canceled without prejudice.

Applicant's claimed invention is directed to an image processing system including a scanner configured to temporarily store fingerprint information, a terminal apparatus configured to temporarily store "second" fingerprint information, and a "fingerprint information collating means" for collating the fingerprint information and the second fingerprint information, so as to determine whether an operation can be performed.

As recited in independent claim 1:

> the fingerprint information stored in the scanner and the second fingerprint
> information stored in the terminal apparatus are deleted upon completion of a
> reading operation of the document image or when a predetermined time has
> elapsed before the reading operation is completed.

In other words, according to the above limitation of claim 1, the fingerprint information and the "second" fingerprint information are deleted from the scanner and the terminal apparatus, respectively.

Claims 19-21 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication 2001-045192 ("the '192 publication") in view of U.S. Patent 6,463,474 to Fuh et al. ("Fuh"). Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '192 publication in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0016912 to Takahashi, and further in view of Fuh.[1] These rejections are respectfully traversed.

---

[1] On page 4 of the Office Action of 08/29/2008, only the '192 publication and Takahashi are listed as being part of the rejection. However, in the detailed rejections on pages 6-11, for example, the Fuh reference is described. Thus, it is believed that Fuh was intended to be included in this rejection.

The proposed combination of the '192 publication in view of Takahashi, and further in view of Fuh does not teach or suggest an image processing system in which fingerprint information stored in a scanner and second fingerprint information stored in a terminal apparatus "are deleted upon completion of a reading operation of the document image or when a predetermined time has elapsed before the reading operation is completed," as recited in independent claim 1.

On page 6, first paragraph of the Office Action of 08/29/2008, it was admitted that the '192 publication and Takahashi references do not teach or suggest the above limitation recited in independent claim 1. The Fuh reference was cited at column 5, lines 11-20, allegedly for disclosing the concept of "removing authentication information (i.e. fingerprint information) if the inactivity timer expires" (see Office Action of 08/29/2008 at page 6, first paragraph).

In Fuh, referring to block 728 of FIG. 7B, a user is authenticated using login information inputted through a client host 306, and a AAA server 218 (see, e.g., column 11, lines 49-55; and column 12, lines 31-32). As described in column 12, lines 35-37 of Fuh, the AAA server 218 has access to a database containing user profiles of authorized users.

In other words, in Fuh, if the user profile accessed by the AAA server 218 was somehow deleted, authentication could not be performed. Therefore, this "authentication information" clearly would not be deleted in Fuh.

Referring to column 14, lines 34-65 of Fuh, it is described that a firewall router 210 obtains the user profile, and temporarily stores the profile in an "authentication cache," where the **authentication cache is deleted** when an inactivity timer expires.

However, <u>in Fuh, the user profile registered in the AAA server 218 is **not** deleted</u>, as deletion of the user profile would prevent the authentication procedure in Fuh from occurring, and thus destroy its operability.

Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Fuh that fingerprint information (or authentication information) stored in a scanner and terminal apparatus "are deleted upon completion of a reading operation of the document image or when a predetermined time has elapsed before the reading operation is completed," as recited in independent claim 1.

Further, as recited in independent claim 1, the deletion of fingerprint information is directly correlated with a reading operation of a document image, which is neither taught nor suggested in the proposed combination of the '192 publication in view of Takahashi, and further in view of Fuh.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the proposed combination of the '192 publication in view of Takahashi, and further in view of Fuh does not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-15 are patentable over the proposed combination.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Date: December 1, 2008

_____
Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874